

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the present application. The Office Action dated February 28, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claims 6 and 9 have been amended, and claim 12 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection and rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 12, 15, 16, and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant acknowledges the allowable subject matter recited in these claims. Applicant has amended independent claim 9 to include the allowable subject matter of claim 12, and cancelled claim 12 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 15, 16 and 19 variously depend from amended claim 9. Accordingly, the objection is overcome. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 9, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,684,557, issued to Matsuda (hereafter "Matsuda") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0101547, issued to Lee et al. (hereafter "Lee '547"); claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda and Lee '547 and further in view of the M. Ohta et al. article cited by Applicant and U.S. Patent No. 6,853,435, issued to Tanaka et al. (hereafter "Tanaka"); claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda and Lee '547 and further in view of Japanese Patent No. 09-213597, issued to Koji et al. (hereafter "Koji"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections because neither Matsuda, Lee '547, the M. Ohta article, Tanaka, nor Koji, analyzed alone or in any combination teaches a method for fabricating an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display panel "wherein the discharging device is disposed at a rear surface of the thin film transistor substrate of the liquid crystal display panel", as recited in allowable claim 9.

Because Matsuda, Lee '547, the M. Ohta article, Tanaka and Koji fail to teach at least the above feature of allowable, independent claim 9, claim 9 and its dependent claims 10-11, 13-

14, and 17-18 are allowable over any combination of Matsuda, Lee '547, the M. Ohta article, Tanaka and Koji. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda, Lee '547 and Koji. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because neither Matsuda, Lee '547 nor Koji, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. For example, Matsuda, Lee '547 and Koji fail to teach or suggest a method for discharging an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display panel that includes "subsequently discharging at least one surface of the liquid crystal display panel using an ionizer system", as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application.

Matsuda, Lee '547 and Koji further fail to teach or suggest a method for discharging an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display panel that includes "after discharging the thin film transistor substrate of the liquid crystal display panel, performing a lighting test for the liquid crystal display panel, as recited in independent claim 6 of the present application.

As recited in independent claim 1 of the present application, an ionizer system is used to discharge at least one surface of the liquid crystal display panel (see, paragraphs [0053] and [0054] and FIGs. 7-8 for discussion of an example of driving an ionizer as a discharging device according to an embodiment of the present application). Applicants respectfully submit Matsuda discloses "a discharge bar 27 is positioned in the vicinity of the side of the set plate 21 where the pressure pins 26 are arranged. The discharge bar 27 is capable of blowing air under pressure for dissipating static electricity or electrostatic charge" (col. 2, lines 41-45). And, Lee '547 discloses shorting bars 101 and 102. However, the discharge bar 27 of Matsuda and the shorting bars 101 and 102 of Lee '547 are not equivalent to the ionizer system recited in independent claim 1. Thus, no combination of Matsuda and Lee '547 would provide a method for discharging an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display panel that includes "subsequently discharging at least one surface of the liquid crystal display panel using an ionizer system", as recited in independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 and 3.

Applicant notes the Office Action relies upon Lee '547 for the teaching of "performing a lighting test for the liquid crystal display panel". However, in Lee '547 "[t]o protect the LCD from electrostatic charges occurring in the manufacturing process, a

Response dated May 26, 2006

Reply to Office Action dated February 28, 2006

electrostatic discharge protection circuit, a TFT and wires are formed in a substrate, a shorting bar is formed inside the cutting line of the substrate, and the substrate is cut to be divided into several TFT substrates. Next, individual LCD panels are formed and the shorting bar is removed by edge-grinding. After visual display tests are performed by applying test signals to each of the wires, polarizers are attached on the LCD panel on which no defect is detected” (see, paragraph [0024]). Applicant submits this is different from the present application in which discharging is performed on the LCD panel to prevent electrostatic stain during the lighting test. More particularly, in the present application, the discharging is performed after the color filter and TFT substrates are attached, and the lighting test for the liquid crystal display panel is performed after the discharging.

Specifically, independent claim 6 requires “providing a liquid crystal layer between the color filter and thin film transistor substrates to form a liquid crystal display panel; subsequently discharging the thin film transistor substrate of the liquid crystal display panel; and after discharging the thin film transistor substrate, performing a lighting test for the liquid crystal display panel.”

Because no combination of Matsuda, Lee ‘547 and Koji teaches at least the above features of independent claim 6 and its dependent claim 7 are allowable over any combination of Matsuda, Lee ‘547 and Koji.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 6 and 7 are respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Application No.: 10/670,380

9

Docket No.: 8734.235 US

Response dated May 26, 2006

Reply to Office Action dated February 28, 2006

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: May 26, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes

Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant

Application No.: 10/670,380

9

Docket No.: 8734.235 US

Response dated May 26, 2006

Reply to Office Action dated February 28, 2006

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: May 26, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes

Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant